

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-13 are pending. By the present amendment, claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarity. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over McComb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,224, hereinafter "McComb") is respectfully traversed. It is noted that without acquiescing in the rejection, claims 1 and 6 have been amended for clarity. Accordingly, the rejection will be discussed with respect to the claims as amended.

Contrary to the allegations set forth in the final Office Action, there is no teaching or suggestion in McComb of the specifically claimed feature of *searching the query store for a previously constructed query that resembles said constructed query*. According to the claimed invention, when a user writes a new query, the system automatically searches the query store looking for a previously stored query that is the same or similar to the new query. McComb may generally disclose the storage of queries for later reconstruction (see, e.g., Col. 4, lines 7-21), but this is not a suggestion of selecting between a new query and a stored one. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, there is no teaching or suggestion of searching the query store or selecting between the new query and a stored one.

In particular, and in complete contrast to the claimed invention, McComb suggests that a new query can be constructed by chaining parts of previous queries together. According to the disclosure of McComb, it is the user's responsibility to locate and identify the previous query (or part of a previous query) that may potentially be reused. The system of McComb will not do this for the user. Moreover, McComb makes clear that great care should be taken by the user in naming queries, suggesting that the user must call up the previous queries by name for later reference (see, e.g., Col. 15, lines 39-42).

In complete contrast, the claimed invention specifically provides a *search tool operable to receive a constructed query and search the query store for a previously constructed query that resembles the constructed query*. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, there is no teaching or suggestion of this feature in McComb. Instead, McComb implies that previously stored queries must be accessed by the user and a new query can then be constructed by the user using parts of previous queries. This is inapposite to the claimed invention wherein a constructed query is compared to previously stored queries in a separate query store using a similarity function. In addition, it is noted that there is no teaching or suggestion in McComb that the query store is separate from the database. Rather, McComb suggests that the queries are stored in the database itself (see, e.g., Col. 5, lines 29-31).

CORLEY et al.
Serial No.: 09/647,711
Amendment dated June 1, 2004
Response to Office Action dated February 3, 2004

It is axiomatic that in order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of the claim. As set forth above, McComb fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in McComb of the specifically recited features of *searching the query store for a previously constructed query that resembles said constructed query* or that the query store is *separate from the database*. With respect to the query store being separate from the database, McComb specifically teaches the opposite. Therefore, McComb fails to anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 3, 4, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over McComb in view of Malloy (U.S. Patent No. 5,787,234) is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Malloy fails to overcome the fundamental deficiencies noted above with respect to McComb. Therefore, even if, *arguendo*, the combination of McComb and Malloy were proper, the combination nevertheless fails to render the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

CORLEY et al.

Serial No.: 09/647,711


Amendment dated June 1, 2004

Response to Office Action dated February 3, 2004

Should the Examiner deem that further issues require resolution prior to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.


Updeep S. Gill
Registration No. 37,334

USG:jsm
1100 North Glebe Road
8th Floor
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100